

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/898,809	RAJAGOPALAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas McKenzie Ph.D.	1624	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thomas McKenzie Ph.D. (3) _____

(2) Beverly Lyman. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 29 January 2003 .

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____ .

Claim(s) discussed: all .

Identification of prior art discussed: none .

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicants proposed abstract would overcome objection #5. Proposed amendments would overcome objections #6 and #7. Applicants propose changing claim 1 from a compound to a composition claim. Thus, retaining the word comprising. The Examiner suggested adding and pharmaceutically acceptable carrier. This would overcome rejection #8. The structures of the radical functioning as the recognition site, fragment E will be clarified. Applicants propose a rule 132 declaration from inventors clarify that this is an art-recognized term and clarifying what structures are intended. Reference to literature was suggested if needed. This would overcome rejections #9-#13. Applicants will amend claim 2, to indicate that C_6H_5 is the radical "derived from benzene. A similar meaning will be ascribed to derived from cyanine *etc* as discussed point point #14. Applicants' intended meaning of cyanine dye was discussed. There appear to be competing definitions of what is a cyanine dye. The Examiner suggested putting specific language into the claim as to what is a cyanine, relying upon the examples in the specification as support. This would overcome the rejection made in point #15. A clear definition of what structures are encompassed by radical E will overcome the enablement rejection made in point #16. The

written description rejections made in points #17 and #18 are logically equivalent to the indefiniteness rejections to the same claims. A cure of the indefiniteness will necessarily also overcome the written description rejections simultaneously. A definition of the structure of the binding fragment, radical E, will also cure the enablement rejection made in point #19. *TLR*